

Docket No. 0879-0261P

Appl. No.: 09/550,278

Art Unit: 2612

Amendment dated February 6, 2004

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2003

Page 4 of 9

### **REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided in the present application. Claims 1-3 are currently pending in the instant application. Claims 1-3 have been amended. Claim 1 is independent.

### **Drawings**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of approval of the formal formal drawings filed on April 14, 2000.

### **Priority**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of acceptance of the certified copy of the corresponding claimed priority document.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Cho (U.S. Patent No. 5,523,783). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot.

Docket No. 0879-0261P

Appl. No.: 09/550,278

Art Unit: 2612

Amendment dated February 6, 2004

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2003

Page 5 of 9

Without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify the claimed invention for the benefit of the Examiner. Accordingly, this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot.

Specifically, Applicant submits that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the unique combination of limitations of the claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Applicant submits that the amendments to the claims are fully supported by the original written description, including, but not limited to page 4, line 20 through page 6, line 17 of the present application.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the unique combination of limitations of the claimed invention, including the feature(s) of: "a data converter which *converts a communication data outputted from the operation part including the control signal into a data format used in serial communication, which conforms with a data format for the remote control pan head*, and transmits the converted communication data to the remote control pan head." (emphasis added) Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Docket No. 0879-0261P

Appl. No.: 09/550,278

Art Unit: 2612

Amendment dated February 6, 2004

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2003

Page 6 of 9

In contrast to the claimed invention, Cho (US5,523,783) is directed to a pan head control system for automatically panning and tilting a TV camera, wherein coordinate data representing points designated by the light pen is converted into control data, which corresponds to amounts of panning and tilting, so that the TV camera is panned and tilted in accordance therewith (Col. 5 lines 27-39).

In addition, the prior art of record merely teaches that data or a data format provided by other means such as a light pen, mouse and joystick is converted into a data format applicable for the control system. The cited references fail to teach or suggest a converter that converts a control signal for controlling a pan head system into a data format applicable to a remote control pan head. In contrast, a communication format of the control unit in the claimed invention is converted into a data format applicable to the pan head so as to avoid an occurrence where the pan head is not controlled by the control unit, e.g., even if data formats of communication data differ between the control unit and the pan head. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Docket No. 0879-0261P

Appl. No.: 09/550,278

Art Unit: 2612

Amendment dated February 6, 2004

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2003

Page 7 of 9

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Cho in view of Cortjens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,515,099). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described in greater detail hereinabove, Applicant submits that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the unique combination of limitations of the claimed invention of claim 1. Since Cortjens et al. fail to teach or suggest the shortcomings of the Cho reference, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Cortjens (US5,515,099) discloses a video conferencing system, wherein the network converter 11 converts signals from the mouse 12 or the joystick 18 into signals appropriate for the pan/tilt mechanism (Col. 6, lines 48-51). However, Cortjens et al. fail to teach or suggest a converter that converts a control signal for controlling a pan head system into a data format applicable to a remote control pan head. Therefore, the unique communication format of the control unit in the claimed invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

Docket No. 0879-0261P

Appl. No.: 09/550,278

Art Unit: 2612

Amendment dated February 6, 2004

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2003

Page 8 of 9

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections are respectfully requested. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in a condition for allowance.

As to the dependent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable due to their dependence upon an allowable independent claim, as well as for additional limitations provided by these claims.

### **CONCLUSION**

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state-of-the-art, no further comments are deemed necessary with respect thereto.

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

Applicants respectfully petition under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and § 1.17 for a one-month extension of time in which to respond to the

Docket No. 0879-0261P  
Appl. No.: 09/550,278  
Art Unit: 2612  
Amendment dated February 6, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2003  
Page 9 of 9

Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of **\$110.00** is attached hereto.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Matthew T. Shanley, Registration No. 47,074 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
f/v Marc S. Weiner  
Reg. No. 32,181 # 43,368

MSW/MTS/mmi

P. O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000